

R E M A R K S

Claims 1-22 are pending in the application. Claims 2-4 and 13-15 are withdrawn from consideration. Claims 1, 5-12 and 16-22 are rejected.

The drawing Figs. 1-7, 11 and 25 are objected to. Proposed corrections are shown in red on the copies of the drawings attached. Applicant will submit formal substitutes upon approval by the Examiner.

The specification has been clarified on pages 12 and 15. No new matter is entered.

Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 11, 12, and 22 to clarify the claimed invention.

In addition claims 6-10 and 17-21 have been amended to independent form including the limitations of the base claims 5 and 16, which have been cancelled herein. No prior art has been applied against dependent claims 6-10, 17-21. It is respectfully submitted these claims are in condition for allowance.

Claims 6-11 and 17-22 are rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph as indefinite. In the claims applicant has included the spelling of the protocol being utilized together with the abbreviation. For example CR-LDP and RSVP. Applicant submits that the remaining words are supported and defined in applicant's disclosure providing a clear definition of their meaning as used in the claimed invention. For example Figures 14-18 and pages 27-29. However if the Examiner believes further clarification is necessary the examiner is invited to telephone applicant's representative before a further Office Action is issued.

Claims 1, 5, 11, 12, 16 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102 as being anticipated by Raj et al. (U.S. 6,628,649) (Raj). Claims 5 and 16 have been cancelled obviating their rejection.

Claims 1 and 12:

Applicant's claim 1 includes logically dividing a label switching router (LSR) into a plurality of LSRs each having a label switching function; and merely specifying, when setting a label switched path (LSP) on the basis of an explicit route specified, a port or a port group of an egress node that corresponds to the LSR terminating the LSP within the plurality of logically divided LSRs.

For example in this routing method in a label switching system in Fig. 8, the LSR 10 is divided into LSR 1 – LSR 4. When setting the LSP on the basis of an explicit route a port or a port group of an egress node (LSR 3 or LSR 4) that corresponds to the LSR (LSR 3 or LSR 4) terminating the LSP within the plurality of logically divided LSRs need merely be specified.

In contrast, Raj does not disclose or describe the first and second steps that are the features of, for example, claim 1. In Raj, label switch routers LSRs (160 – 163 in FIG. 3) and label switch controllers LSCs (201-1 – 201-N in FIGs. 6 and 9) of LSR (200) are not logically divided into a plurality of LSRs.

In applicant's logically divided LSR a port or a port group of an egress node can be specified that corresponds to the LSR terminating the LSP within the plurality of logically divided LSRs.

In contrast, Raj describes the LSCs (201-1 – 201-N) of the LSR (200) merely provide a redundant structure in the event of a failure of one of the LSCs.

A packet router according to applicant's claim 12 includes "a logical router configuring module..." and "a module for specifying..." as at least a distinguishable features from Raj.

It is respectfully submitted that Raj fails to disclose each and every feature of the rejected claims and the rejection should be withdrawn.

Claims 11 and 22:

Applicant's claim 11 describes specifying an MPLS explicit route by adding, to an MPLS-to-IP forwarding function of a port group in one specified egress node, a communication function with the MPLS-to-IP forwarding function of a port group in an intra-system other egress node, and a forwarding function to the port group in the intra-system other egress node.

Applicant's claimed forwarding function is not disclosed in the cited reference Raj. In Raj there is no mention of the MPLS-to-IP forwarding function, the communication function, and the forwarding function in the label switch routers LSRs (160 – 163 in FIG. 3), label switch controllers LSCs (201-1 – 201-N in FIGs. 6, 9 and 12) of LSR (200), and label edge routers (153, 154 in FIG.3 and 210, 211 in FIG.6).

Applicant's apparatus claim 22, although different from claim 11 includes the features of the forwarding which is not found in the cited reference. Claim 22 has "a module for specifying..." as at least a distinguishable features from the reference.

It is respectfully submitted that Raj fails to disclose each and every feature of the rejected claims 11 and 22 and the rejection should be withdrawn.

In view of the remarks set forth above, this application is in condition for allowance which action is respectfully requested. However, if for any reason the Examiner should consider this application not to be in condition for allowance, the Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned attorney at the number listed below prior to issuing a further Action.

Any fee due with this paper may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-1290.

Respectfully submitted,



Brian S. Myers
Reg. No. 46,947

CUSTOMER NUMBER 026304
Telephone: (212) 940-8703
Fax: (212) 940-8986 or 8987
Docket No.: FUJY 17.914 (100794-11533
BSM:fd